

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-24 remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 15 are independent. Claims have been amended merely to correct for antecedent basis issues. The scopes of the claims remain substantially the same.

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on July 23, 2004.

§ 102 REJECTION - KOJIMA

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 13, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kojima, et al. (U.S.P. 6,233,066, hereinafter "Kojima"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As discussed in the interview, the claim language clearly requires that the image read or scanned to generate current image data is the **same image** initially or previously read or scanned. It was agreed during the interview that Kojima cannot

be relied upon to teach or suggest at least this feature. Therefore, independent claims 1, 2, 8, and 15 are distinguishable over Kojima. Claims 3, 6-7, 13, and 16 depend from independent claims 1, 2, 8, and 15, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated with respect to the independent claims, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over Kojima.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 13 and 15-16, based on Kojima, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTIONS - KOJIMA, OOTA

Claims 4-5 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kojima and in view of Oota (U.S.P. 4,532,558, hereinafter "Oota"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

It is noted that claims 4-5 and 11-12 depend from independent claims 1, 2, 8, and 9. It has been shown above that these independent claims are distinguishable over Kojima. Oota has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Kojima. Therefore, independent claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 are distinguishable over the

combination of Kojima and Oota. For at least due to their dependencies on these independent claims, dependent claims 4-5 and 11-12 are also distinguishable the combination of Kojima and Oota.

Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4-5 and 11-12, based on Kojima and Oota, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTIONS - KOJIMA

Claims 9-10, 14, 17-18, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kojima. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Regarding independent claim 9, as discussed during the interview, Kojima cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest that the image read or scanned to generate the first image characteristics data is the same image read or scanned to generate the second image characteristics data. Therefore, claim 9 is distinguishable over Kojima. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, claim 14 is also distinguishable over Kojima for at least the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 9.

Claim 17-18 and 21-23 depend from independent claim 15, and it has been shown above that claim 15 is distinguishable over Kojima. Therefore, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over Kojima for at least the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 15.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9-10, 14, 17-18, and 21-23, based on Kojima, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTIONS - KOJIMA, KUBO

Claims 19-20, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kojima in view of Kubo, et al. (U.S.P. 5,828,461, hereinafter "Kubo"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

It is noted that these claims depend from independent claim 15, directly or indirectly. Kubo has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Kojima. Therefore, claim 15 is distinguishable over the combination of Kojima and Kubo. Therefore, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over Kojima and Kubo for at least the reasons stated with respect to independent claim 15.

U.S. Application No. 09/384,585
Docket No. 1982-0133P
August 4, 2004
Art Unit: 2626
Page 19 of 20

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 19-20, and 24, based on Kojima and Kubo, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional

U.S. Application No. 09/384,585

Docket No. 1982-0133P

August 4, 2004


Art Unit: 2626

Page 20 of 20

fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly,
extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By:  #39,491
for Michael K. Mutter HNS
Reg. No. 29,680

MKM/HNS/lab
1982-0133P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000